

324.23  
An 87

WESTERN RESERVE  
CLEVELAND  
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

# Anti=Imperialism

IS

## Old Copperheadism.

How the Northern Traitors of 1864 Wailed Over the  
Declaration of Independence, Reviled Lincoln  
and Fumed Against Militarism.

### HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

Democrat and Republican, friend and foe, agree that the central thought of Mr. Bryan's speech at Indianapolis is in applying to the issues of the day, the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Interpreting this as if it requires in all cases, and under all circumstances, an absolute rule by the majority, told off by the head in each community, Mr. Bryan necessarily contemplates a partial paralysis of the Constitution and the courts.

Magnified, falsified and perverted in just this manner, the doctrine of so-called anti-imperialism and "consent of the governed" is one sadly known to American history.

#### First Attack on Imperialism.

Alexander Long, of Ohio, began his celebrated attack on Lincoln and imperialism in 1864 in a speech in the House of Representatives, April 8, saying:

"A little over three years ago the present occupant of the presidential mansion at the other end of the Avenue, came into this city under cover of night disguised in a plaid cloak and Scotch cap, lest, as was feared by his friends, he might have received a warmer greeting than would have been agreeable on his way through Baltimore."

## **Lincoln's Militarism.**

Mr. Long proceeded to argue that the President, who had entered the Capital in this manner, had, in the course of four years, established an odious rule of militarism. He said:

"Are we not in Constantinople, in St. Petersburg, in Vienna, in Rome, or in Paris? Military government and their provost marshals override the laws, and the echo of the armed heel rings forth as clearly now in America as in France or in Austria; and the President sits to-day guarded by armed soldiery stationed at every approach leading to the Executive Mansion."

Opposing this militarism, Mr. Long demanded an immediate cessation of the war, saying:

"Can the Union be restored by war? I answer most unhesitatingly and deliberately, no, never; war is final, eternal separation. My first and highest ground of opposition to its further prosecution is, that it is wrong; it is in violation of the Constitution and of the fundamental principles on which the federal Union was founded. My second objection is that as a policy, it is not reconstructive but destructive, and will, if continued, result speedily in the destruction of the government and the laws of civil liberty to both north and south, and it ought therefore to immediately cease."

## **Quoting Jefferson as Satan Quotes Scripture.**

As a further reason for stopping the war, Mr. Long quoted the Declaration of Independence precisely as Mr. Bryan does to-day, and said:

"Three years' experience in attempting by numerical preponderance and military prowess of one section, exerted to coerce the other into submission, has convinced me more thoroughly that it is as self-contradictory as it is dangerous; because it violates the great principles of free governments which derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and dangerous because by its exercise, especially when wielded by a weak, vacillating and unscrupulous man, it destroys instead of maintaining the Union."

## **Ruinous Militarism and Odious Emancipation.**

Mr. Long went on:

"If the time ever was when the Union could have been restored by war (which I don't believe) it has long since been dispelled by emancipation, conscription, amnesty and the like; proclamations, military orders, annulling state constitutions, setting aside state laws, obliterating state lines and attempting to organize and set up a form of state government in their stead in which if one man out of ten, who shall turn Abolitionist, take and subscribe an oath to execute and obey the law of Abraham Lincoln, whatever it may be, he shall govern and rule over the remaining nine who refuse to become Abolitionists."



## More Bryanism.

Mr. Long continued:

"Mr. Chairman, if we cannot rise above the Austro-Russian principle of holding subject provinces by the power of force and coercion, what becomes of the Declaration of Independence and of all our teaching for eighty years? After all, Mr. Chairman, it is not the extent of territory which should be the object of our desires. Better sacrifice even nine-tenths of the territory than destroy our Republican form of government \* \* \* land is nothing compared to liberty \* \* \* pride of territorial ambition is a vulgar and low ambition of national greatness."

## Lincoln's Militarism Absolute Ruin to the Union.

Said Mr. Long further:

"It is the object of the sword to cut and cleave asunder but never to unite. \* \* \* I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that in attempting to preserve our jurisdiction over the southern states, we have lost our constitutional form of government over the northern states. Our government, as we all know, is not anything resembling what it was three years ago; there is not one single vestige of the Constitution remaining; every clause and every letter of it has been violated and I have no idea myself that it will ever again be respected."

Mr. Long concluded with this avowal, which showed him to be no war Democrat, but a believer in Bryan's doctrine as to the "consent of the governed":

"I say further, Mr. Chairman, that if this war is to be still further prosecuted, I for one prefer that it shall be done under the auspices of those who now conduct its management, as I do not want the party with which I am connected to be in any degree responsible for its results, which can not be otherwise than disastrous and suicidal; let the responsibility remain where it is until we can have a change of policy instead of men, if such a thing is possible. Nothing could be more fatal for the Democratic party than to seek to come into power, pledged to a continuance of the war policy."

## How Garfield Scarified Long.

This speech of Long's created a tremendous sensation in the house. Up to that time the war Democrats had controlled their party for the most part in the house, but Mr. Long, looking to the opening presidential campaign, tried to start a new policy. The first to reply to him was General Garfield, who sprang to his feet, claimed the floor, and in a manner indicative of great suppressed indignation said:

"Mr. Chairman, I should be obliged to you if you would direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to bring a white flag and plant it in the aisle between myself and my colleague, who has just addressed you."

Alluding to the use of the white flag with an honest enemy in war and giving Long credit for sincerity and candor, General Garfield, then fresh from service in the army, went on :

“But now I ask you to take away the flag of truce and I will go back inside the Union lines and speak of what he has done. I am reminded by it of a distinguished character in *Paradise Lost*, that ‘when he had rebelled against the glory of God and led away a third part of Heaven’s sons, conjured against the Highest, when after terrible battles in which mountains and hills were hurled by each contending host with ‘jaculations dire’; when at last the latter and his hosts were hurled down nine times the space that measures day and night, and after the terrible fall lay stretched prone on the burning Lake, Satan lifted up his shattered bulk, crossed the abyss, looked down into Paradise, and soliloquizing, said :

‘Which way I fly is hell ; myself, am hell.’

It seems to me in that utterance, he expressed the very sentiment to which you have just listened; uttered by one, no less brave, malign and fallen. This man gathers up the meaning of this great contest, the philosophy of the moment, the prophesies of the hour in sight of the paradise of victory and peace, utters them all in this wail of terrible despair, ‘which way I fly is hell.’ He ought to add, ‘myself, am hell.’ ”

## **No Consent Asked—Constitution and the Laws to Be Enforced.**

General Garfield although more profoundly moved than ever before or afterwards in his service in Congress, nevertheless proceeded to make this calm, logical, statesmanlike reply to Long:

“The gentleman has told us, there is no such thing as coercion justifiable under the Constitution. I ask him for one moment to reflect that no statute ever was enforced without coercion. It is the basis of every law in the universe—God’s law, as well as man’s; a law is no law without coercion behind it. When a man has murdered his brother, coercion takes the murderer, tries him, and hangs him. When you levy your taxes, coercion secures their collection; it follows the shadow of the thief and brings him to justice; it accompanies your diplomacy to foreign courts and backs the declaration of the Nation’s rights by a pledge of the Nation’s power; but when the life of that nation is imperilled we are told it has no coercive power against the parricides in its own bosom.”

## **Bryanism Considered Treason in 1864.**

With this all-sufficient reply from the standpoint of logic and law, General Garfield could no longer restrain the righteous indignation which boiled within him. He said:

“Now in the quiet of these halls, hatched in the lowest depths of a dark treason, there rises a Benedict Arnold and proposes to surrender us all up, body



and spirit, the nation and the flag, its genius, and its honor, now and forever, to the accursed traitors of our country, and that proposition comes—God forgive and pity my beloved state—it comes from a citizen of the honored and loyal commonwealth of Ohio.

I implore you, brethren in this house, not to believe that many such births ever give pangs to my mother state such as she suffered when that traitor was born [suppressed applause and sensation]. I beg you not to believe that on the soil of that state another such growth has ever deformed the face of nature and forgotten the light of God's day [an audible whisper, 'Vallandigham'] but ah, I am reminded there are other such. My zeal and love for Ohio have carried me too far."

### **Effort to Expel Long as a Traitor.**

The indignation excited by Long's speech did not subside even after Garfield's reply. The next day, April 9th, Speaker Colfax left his chair and came down to the floor to address the house. Among other things he said:

"You should call no more soldiers into the field to endeavor by the peril of their lives to save this country, because it is a solemn mockery to do so if from this hall shall go forth the words of encouragement to strengthen those arrayed against them in an unholy and parricidal work."

Mr. Colfax then offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, that Alexander Long, a representative from the second district of Ohio, having on the 8th of April, 1864, declared himself in favor of recognizing the independence and nationality of the so-called confederacy now in arms against the Union, and thereby give aid, countenance and encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostility to the United States, is hereby expelled."

Practically the entire Democratic side rallied to the defense of Mr. Long. Allen, of Illinois, Harris of Maryland, Cox of Ohio, Wood of New York, Voorhees of Indiana, and Pendleton of Ohio were among those who spoke in his defense. In the course of the discussion Harris of Maryland used language fully as treasonable as Long, and a resolution to expel him was introduced, but failed of a two-thirds vote, the roll call showing eighty-one for expulsion and fifty-eight against. Some Republicans took the ground that free speech could not be in any way abridged in the house. The resolution was then changed to one of censure, declaring Harris "an unworthy member of this house," which was adopted by ninety-three to eighteen. A similar change was then made in the resolution affecting Long, and it was adopted by a vote of eighty to sixty-nine.

Long, who was not merely an anti-war man but a peace Democrat (otherwise known as copperheads), not only succeeded in bringing the party to his support in Congress, but as a delegate in the National Democratic convention a few months later, made a speech in which he denounced Lincoln's "odious emancipation proclamation." It will be noted that this entire proceeding, hideous and disgraceful as it was, arose from an adoption of the precise dogma which Bryan is proclaiming to-day as to the consent of the governed, militarism and coercion.

## **The Bryan-Long Parallel.**

Bryan's Indianapolis speech opened the campaign of 1900, just as E. D. Washburne said that Alexander Long struck the keynote for 1864. A few of his utterances and those of others of the same copperhead stripe (including Vallandigham, who was afterwards sent through the lines for treason), may well be set in close comparison with those of Bryan now.

### **Bryan at Indianapolis.**

Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying and brutal doctrine of imperialism with the Golden Rule.

---

### **Bryan at Indianapolis.**

They must expect the subject races to protest against such a policy and to resist to the extent of their ability \* \* \* Our whole history is an encouragement to all who are denied a voice in their own government.

---

### **Bryan at Indianapolis, 1900.**

I assert that on the important issues of the day, the Republican party is dominated by those influences which constantly tend to elevate pecuniary considerations and ignore human rights.

---

### **Bryan at Indianapolis.**

It is not necessary to own people in order to trade with them. We carry on trade to-day with every part of the world and our commerce has expanded more rapidly than the commerce of any European power. We do not own Japan or China, but we trade with their peoples.

---

### **Bryan's Indianapolis Speech, August 8th, 1900.**

But if it were possible to obliterate every word written or spoken in defense of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, a war of conquest would still leave its legacy of perpetual hatred, for it was God himself

### **C. L. Vallandigham, Speech, Jan. 14, 1863.**

The spirit of non-intervention is the very spirit of peace and concord.

---

### **Fernando Wood, Jan. 14, 1864.**

No government can be lasting that is not founded on the consent of the governed \* \* \* these political jackals, known as war Democrats \* \* \* the bloody and brutal policies of the administration.—[Lincoln.] \* \* \* There is no such thing as a war Democrat.

---

### **Fernando Wood, April 19, 1864, In the House,**

Said the government under the Lincoln Administration "chose rather to increase the rent of the poor man's tenement than to dim the lustre of the jobber's palace."

---

### **Alexander Long, Demanding Recognition of the Southern Confederacy.**

The great object of our government should be to develop and cultivate the internal resources of those friendly to its jurisdiction rather than to extend it over hostile and foreign peoples [Confederates.]

---

### **Alexander Long In the House, February 7th, 1865.**

Every month it [the war] has been continued for coercion and subjugation has only tended to cement, perpetuate, and traditionalize hatred of the north in every southern household.

---



who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. He never made a race of people so low in the scale of civilization or intelligence that it would welcome a foreign master.

---

**Mr. Bryan at Indianapolis.**

If we are to govern them [the Filipinos] without their consent, and give them no voice in determining the taxes which they must pay, we dare not educate them lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and mock us for our inconsistencies.

---

**Bryan at Indianapolis.**

That the leaders of a great party should claim for any President or Congress the right to treat millions of people as mere possessions and deal with them unrestrained by the Constitution or the bill of rights, shows how far we have already departed from the ancient landmarks, and indicates what may be expected if this nation deliberately enters upon a career of empire.

---

**Bryan at Indianapolis.**

Better a thousand times that our flag in the Orient give way to the flag representing the idea of self-government, than that the flag of this Republic should become the flag of an empire.

**Benjamin G. Harris of Maryland—Same Debate.**

If we are to have dissolution, in the name of God, let us have it. Let us have it, and instead of having one great consolidated government, one imperial government, one splendid government, let us have on this continent two happy governments.

---

**Alexander Long—Same Debate.**

The experiment, now being tried at so fearful a sacrifice of blood and treasure will in the end demonstrate to the world that confederacies can not be held good by the mad policy of coercion. Governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed and existing only in the hearts and affections of the people, can not be held together by force. \* \* \* There never has been and never can be a Union founded on the coercion and subjugation of sovereign states.

---

**Alexander Long—Same Debate.**

Engaged in the pursuance of wealth and material pleasures, they have apparently taken little interest in the question [preservation of the Constitution], content even to accept a despotism that did not prohibit their sacrifices at the footstool of mammon. Their only idea has been to preserve the territory, the land, of the Republic intact; and if that was effected, the form and nature of the government over it was a secondary consideration.

---

**Alexander Long.**

The Union of 1789 is gone never to be restored. If we who yet claim to be under the forms of the Constitution would save anything from a political and social wreck; if we desire even to make an effort to again recover our lost condition, we must abandon the war, recognize the sovereignty and separate independence of the states and their right of self-government, and then begin the work of reorganization anew in a spirit of mutual compromise and concession.

### **Adlai Stevenson at Indianapolis.**

Against this policy stands imperialism. Imperialism knows nothing of limitations of power. Its rule is outside the Constitution. It means the establishment by the American Republic of the colonial methods of European monarchies. It means the right to hold alien peoples as subjects. It enthrones force as the controlling agency in government. It means the empire.

---

### **Bryan at Indianapolis.**

If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed it is impossible to secure title to people either by force or by purchase.

### **C. L. Vallandigham Speech, January 14, 1863.**

I have denounced from the beginning the usurpations and the infractions, one and all, of law and Constitution by the President [Lincoln] and those under him.

J. K. Edgerton in his speech of February 20, 1865, said there was one choice only:

“A separation of the sections or a war of absolute subrogation or extermination of the states to end in military and monarchical despotism.

“Lincoln loves power; he will bear no rival near the throne to share his honors as the great emancipator.”

---

### **George Bliss of Ohio in a Copperhead Speech of March 12, 1864, in the House.**

They [the Southern States] are to be governments not in the language of the Declaration of Independence, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, but as governments imposed upon the people by the omnipotency of the President [Lincoln.]

## **A Dangerous Doctrine Now and Then.**

No honorable Democrat cares to revive this deplorable incident in the history of his party, where the anti-war or peace element (known in that day as copperheads) gained the ascendancy, overpowered the loyal war Democrats and committed the organization to a wrongheaded and disgraceful opposition to Lincoln, but everyone should know that disgraceful transaction was done in the name of the precise doctrine Bryan is preaching now—zeal for consent of the governed and opposition to alleged militarism.

When men like Vallandigham and Long and Bryan go to putting their anarchist interpretations on the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, it is time to throw out cautionary signals. Now, as in 1864, there is danger of great dishonor to the Democratic party from an unworthy leader and of alarm to the country from the renewal of a destructive dogma. Appropriately enough, this theory of the consent of the governed, as fanatically pushed beyond all limits, is being preached by Mr. Bryan in the same sentences which breathe forth threats not only against the financial honor of the country and the authority of its Supreme Court, but against the proper and orderly action of the people themselves.



## **The Climax of Mob Rule.**

Eating of the same insane root which drove Long and Vallandigham into political madness in 1864, Mr. Bryan put a fit climax to his dangerous and distorted doctrine when in his speech at Springfield, Ohio, he said to the crowd:

“You have the power and the right *to take the reins of government into your own hands* and administer the law, not for foreign syndicates, but for the people of the United States.”

After Mr. Bryan had been criticised for this dangerous doctrine, he deliberately repeated it with emphasis, saying in his speech at Ottumwa, Iowa:

“The people suffer until suffering ceases to be a virtue; they are patient until patience is exhausted, and then *they arouse themselves, take the reins of government*, and put the government back upon its old foundation.”

John C. Calhoun never equalled that. Let it be said of the arch-nullifier that he contemplated a three-fourths vote of all the states as necessary to give full and final validity and power to an ordinance of nullification. He had, at least, some respect for the provision of the Federal Constitution which requires two-thirds of Congress or of the state legislatures to propose amendments, and then a three-fourths vote of all the states to ratify them. Such is the requirement of the Constitution, but Bryan tells the crowd they can change or alter the government at their own will without regard to the Constitution.

Appropriately enough did this same Bryan call out in his speech at Brooklyn four years ago:

“The Supreme Court changes from time to time. Judges die or resign, and new judges take their places. When did our opponents find that a decision of the Supreme Court was so sacred?”

It is time for the people to say what they think of pushing the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson to such excess and danger. In 1864 it meant Copperheadism and virtual treason, and in 1900 it smacks of political mob rule and the overthrow of the Supreme Court.

The doctrine of those who assailed Lincoln has been quoted not merely to show the grotesque absurdity or inconsistency of Bryan in citing him now. Beyond that—instructive to the people as that is—they should see that the vaporings against the Supreme Court and the demagogical misrepresentation of popular authority are rooted in the old copperhead doctrine of 1864, which now, as in the past and the future, must of necessity put forth only evil and dangerous fruit.

## **Adlai Stevenson Too.**

As if to make the connection between the distorted consent of the governed dogma in 1864 and 1900 perfectly clear, it was not left for Bryan to preach the old doctrine from the old text, but Adlai Stevenson had to be put on the ticket with him. Mr. Stevenson is an old timer whose political activity dates back to 1864, when he was a candidate for presidential elector on the consent of the governed platform of that year as gotten up by the Longs and Vallandighams and other

enemies of Lincoln. He stood on that platform and in public speeches approved all its utterances, including the declaration that the war for the Union was a failure. The doctrine which Bryan preaches is no new thing to Stevenson.

### **Stevenson's Record.**

"There seems to be a general belief that Adlai E. Stevenson has a war record," said ex-Governor Hamilton of Illinois, in an interview in Chicago, June 24, 1892, "and so he has, but it is not exactly the record that will make him popular with lovers of the Union, or will make the battle-scarred veteran enthusiastic in his support."

"Now," continued the ex-governor, "I do not want to do anything or to be quoted as saying anything harsh in regard to Mr. Stevenson. He and I are friends. We practiced law at the same time in Bloomington. Together and opposed to each other, we have fought many a hard legal battle. We were neighbors, and the members of our families were very intimate. So I do not wish to be construed as making any personal attack on Mr. Stevenson. When I was a boy I lived in Marshall County. It was during the war, and Mr. Stevenson was said to be a most unrelenting copperhead. It was generally so understood and accepted as a fact. He was in fact a most intense sympathizer with the rebels in the South."

"I belonged to what was known then as a Union League. Opposed to us was the organization known as a Golden Circle. It was organized for the purpose of assisting the rebel cause and aiding them, not only by expressions of sympathy, but in every possible way, even to fitting out men for the southern army. Mr. Stevenson was, so it was said, a permanent officer in that region; in fact, it was claimed by some that he was an organizer. As long as he remained in that district, he had the reputation of having once been a copperhead. When he made his races for Congress the thing has been brought up repeatedly, and these charges are of long standing in Bloomington. I understand it is claimed by some that the Bloomington Pantagraph has affidavits of men who swear that as an officer of the Golden Circle he had drilled them. There was a place in Woodward County known as Hoosham's Pasture, a secluded, quiet place where the drills took place."

### **Shooting Niagara.**

Up to the winter of 1864, a considerable number of Democrats in Congress held back from the ultra and destructive interpretation of the Declaration of Independence, but the Long-Vallandigham outburst drew the lines and forced them to take a stand for or against Lincoln, to become War Democrats or go over to the Copperheads. It was impossible to shoot Niagara and stop half way down. Those who were not for the Union were against it, and could not claim to be true loyalists while fighting Lincoln with false cries of militarism and imperialism.



Among those who then sounded the cry of militarism loudest was Congressman John D. Stiles, of Pennsylvania, who said in the House, July 4th, 1864:

"Sir, it would seem that an offended God has already made visible the signs of retribution for the recklessness with which we have been plunged into civil strife. Our deluded people have witnessed as its consequences the destruction of all that was most precious to them of their political inheritance. The shrine of their liberty has been profaned and its costly treasures trampled under foot. They have seen the bayonet at their ballot boxes, the bayonet in their courts of justice, the bayonet in their legislative halls, at their homesteads, and at their bedsides in the dead of night. At every place once held sacred the bayonet has been seen, threatening, insulting, and applying the rule of force to the will of freemen."

### **Lincoln a Caesar.**

"We have seen the elective franchise controlled by armed force in States powerless to resist the minions of tyranny who thwarted them in the exercise of their most sacred right. Our Caesar then passed his Rubicon, and the Republic may well fear that he will not henceforward pause in his unlawful career, unless he be swept from its course by the torrent of the popular will sustaining the ballot-box, if need be, with weapons as those which have assailed it."

### **Militarism with a Vengeance.**

Another Copperhead who foamed with charges of militarism against the Lincoln Administration was Congressman Andrew J. Rogers of New Jersey. Hear him in his speech of April 14, 1864:

"When I reflect upon the awful and solemn events which surround us, I can but weep for the unity and liberties of my country, and I, in these once sacred Halls of Congress, raise my humble voice and call upon every man, woman and child in this land, and entreat them to advocate some reasonable compromise before our country's doom shall be forever sealed. My soul sickens at the radicalism and fanaticism of the age, unnecessarily squandering away our resources, wasting our public treasure, and spilling the people's blood."

### **Wailing over the Declaration.**

Then, as now, there was loud wailing over the Declaration of Independence. Said Mr. Rogers:

"The rights of free speech are principles of liberty that are laid down in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of my country. Sir, without liberty the Union is worth nothing. I want no such Union as that. It is not such a one as our fathers made, it is not such a one as the patriots and statesmen of the times that tried men's souls established and consolidated for the protection and defense of the liberties of the white race of America. It is a Union of despotism and tyranny, not a Union of fraternal independent States, each legislating for itself its own internal policy. It is a Union without freedom of debate, without freedom to

exercise the constitutional right of free speech, that right which has been guaranteed to us by the laws of God and man. It is a Union without freedom from those unconstitutional, outrageous, and tyrannical acts which have characterized the Administration in power."

### **Voorhees of Indiana on Consent of the Governed.**

But perhaps no one in the Long-Vallandigham crew wailed louder over the ruin of the country or assailed Lincoln and his alleged militarism more bitterly than Voorhees of Indiana, who in his speech of March 5, 1864, said:

"The rebel chief at Richmond, who makes open war against the Union, and the Executive here who does not make war for it, and who would not accept its restoration today on the ancient doctrines of the Constitution, are engaged by conscription, force and violence in hurling against each other the unwilling and peaceful populations of every section, bleeding, palpitating, and mangled, to struggle, to combat and to die, like the gladiators in the amphitheatre of Rome, butchered to make a Roman holiday. These are facts which will not escape history, and yet the consent of the governed is the just measure of power which a public ruler can exercise in a free government, and we fondly imagine that we still are free!"

### **Present Day Anti-Imperialists Outdone.**

Mr. Voorhees in his speech of March 5, 1864, said:

"This government is dying; dying, sir, dying. We are standing around its bed of death and will soon be wretched mourners at its tomb unless the sovereign and heroic remedy is soon applied."

It was not the war or the acts of the confederates in arms which Mr. Voorhees deplored as putting the life of the nation in peril. Not at all. It was because Lincoln and the Republicans were not faithful to the Constitution, which was intended to secure the blessings of liberty, whereas, said Mr. Voorhees:

"Who will dare rise in his place and say this government has been administered during the last three years in a mode even tending toward the accomplishment of these grand results? The very foundations of civilized jurisprudence have been torn away and the whole edifice is in ruins. Not one right which constitutes the freedom and safety of the citizen but what has been wickedly and wantonly violated."

### **Lincoln and His Subordinates in Crime.**

It was this speech of March 5, 1864 (Cong. Globe, Part 4, Page 73), in which Mr. Voorhees exclaimed against "the executive or his subordinates in crime" who had swept away the jury system.



## **Lincoln's Hellish Dance of Glee.**

Mr. Voorhees continued:

"Will some poor crawling and despised sycophant and tool of executive despotism [under Lincoln] dare to say, I shall not pronounce the name of Vallandigham? \* \* \* There is not one square mile of free soil in the American republic. It is slave territory from the Aristook to the Columbia. \* \* \* They [Lincoln and his supporters] invoked the storm which has since rained blood upon the land. They danced with hellish glee around the bubbling caldron of civil war and welcomed with ferocious joy every hurtful mischief which flickered in its lurid and infernal flames."

## **Revival of Copperhead Doctrine.**

Let no man say there is no significance in the revival now of the lurid and baleful Copperhead doctrine of 1864. It is the old text, the old preaching, and the results can only be the cultivation of a dangerous and disloyal spirit—a destructive animus which, as formulated now by Mr. Bryan, its principal spokesman, appropriately enough and in accordance with its fell purpose, aims at the integrity of the Supreme Court, the honor of the Nation's financial system and the maintenance of the Nation's authority in the Phillipines. It can not now assail the very Union itself, but it menaces with deadly purpose much which makes that Union what it is. The governed are not to consent to the preservation of the gold standard, the enforcement of law and treaty obligations in the Phillipines nor even to the decisions of the Supreme Court at home. All sorts of anarchy hatch from that old egg.

In 1864 the Longs and Vallandighams fanatically turned the "consent of the governed" clause of the Declaration against itself and perverted it into sectional anarchy—turned it into a falsified shield behind which seceding states were to defy the laws and constitution of the Union.

With fanaticism like the Longs, and with the scent of a hound for dangerous demagogy, Bryan now seizes on the old Copperhead perversion of 1864. He invokes it now, not to protect seceding states and save slavery, but for ends well nigh as foul and wrong—to estop the assertion of national authority and the suppression of insurrection in our new possessions. Moreover, as if to show how dangerous this perversion must ever be, Bryan, characteristically and appropriately enough for one ever keen to torture honest doctrine, tells the people they can "take the reins into their own hands" and rule regardless of the Constitution, sweeping away its provisions by mere majorities, and, to say nothing of overthrowing financial honor, may subject even the Supreme Court to populist domination.

The American people may be trusted to condemn this insidious and dangerous demagogy. As Daniel Webster said in one of his great arguments, the people have seen fit to put limits to their own power; and they will surely rebuke the man who, torturing and perverting the Declaration of Independence itself, tells them they can 'take the reins into their own hands' regardless of the Constitution or the Supreme Court.

## Failures are Fewer.

LESS BUSINESS WRECKAGE UNDER THE MCKINLEY ADMINISTRATION  
THAN IN EIGHTEEN YEARS.

Calamity Howler Struck Dumb by General Prosperity's Remarkable Exhibit—  
Disastrous Effect of Democracy and Free Trade—Success of Republican Protection.

The real prosperity of a country can always be judged by the number of failures among its business men. It is an astonishing tribute to the sound state of our finances and prosperous commercial condition when Bradstreet's mercantile agency reports for the first six months of the calendar year, 1900, the smallest number of failures noted for eighteen years past. This is a showing for McKinley prosperity that must strike the calamity howlers dumb.

The records of the mercantile agency show that for the first six months of 1892 the business failures of the country were 5,351, with liabilities of \$56,535,521.

In November of that year the Democratic party was voted into power, and in March, 1893, took charge of the country's finances. The first six months of that year showed failures of 6,239 in number, with liabilities of over \$70,000,000.

All through the Democratic free trade Wilson Bill administration the number of failures steadily increased until the first six months of 1896, when they reached the high water mark, viz.: 7,602, with liabilities of \$105,535,936.

In November of that year McKinley prosperity was voted in, and the number of failures steadily declined, until the first six months of 1900 show only 4,880 failures, with liabilities of \$60,064,208, the smallest number reported for eighteen years.

In the following tables are compared the first six months of 1896, the last year of the last Democratic administration, with the first six months of 1900, the last year of President McKinley's present administration. This compares the results of nearly four years of both policies on the business affairs of the country. These tables are worthy of the careful consideration of the free traders and free silver men, as well as of those who believe in the prosperity and protection of a Republican Administration. Thus:

### EASTERN STATES.

#### Number of Failures for Six Months.

	1896.	1900.
Maine.....	140	63
New Hampshire.....	73	55
Vermont.....	37	55
Massachusetts.....	550	756
Rhode Island.....	43	46
Connecticut.....	125	104
Total Eastern States.....	968	1,084

### WESTERN STATES.

	1896.	1900.
Ohio.....	406	180
Indiana.....	155	57
Illinois.....	412	219
Missouri.....	330	197
Michigan.....	173	56
Kansas.....	387	164
Kentucky.....	152	78
Colorado.....	11	36
Total Western States.....	2,026	987



## NORTHWESTERN STATES.

	1896.	1900.
Wisconsin.....	184	70
Minnesota.....	197	79
Iowa.....	178	113
Nebraska.....	125	40
South Dakota.....	24	28
North Dakota.....	6	4
Montana.....	25	13
Wyoming.....	3	6
Total Northwestern States.....	742	353

## MIDDLE STATES.

	1896.	1900.
New York.....	1,059	857
New Jersey.....	110	102
Pennsylvania.....	673	428
Delaware.....	10	11
Total Middle States.....	1,852	1,269

## SOUTHERN STATES.

	1896.	1900.
Maryland.....	75	38
Virginia.....	134	35
West Virginia.....	21	24
North Carolina.....	30	37
South Carolina.....	24	17
Georgia.....	101	64
Florida.....	24	16
Alabama.....	45	35
Mississippi.....	69	31
Louisiana.....	107	47
Texas.....	335	124
Tennessee.....	80	70
Arkansas.....	68	53
District of Columbia.....	28	8
Total Southern States.....	1,161	599

## PACIFIC STATES.

	1896.	1900.
California.....	515	257
Oregon.....	38	53
Nevada.....	.....	3
Utah.....	45	30
Washington.....	104	33
Idaho.....	12	6
Total Pacific States.....	764	382

## TERRITORIES.

	1896.	1900.
Arizona.....	12	2
Indian Territory.....	19	38
New Mexico.....	21	2
Alaska.....	1	...
Oklahoma.....	36	34
Totals.....	89	76

# SUMMARY OF THE ABOVE.

	1896.	1900.
Eastern States.....	968	1,084
Middle States.....	1,852	1,398
Western States.....	2,026	987
Northwestern States .....	742	353
Southern States.....	1,161	599
Pacific States.....	764	382
Territories.....	89	77
Total—United States.....	7,602	4,880

The liabilities of those failing for the first six months of the two years compared are as follows :

	1896.	1900.
Eastern States.....	\$ 11,233,158	\$ 13,898,018
Middle States .....	33,320,605	29,704,398
Western States.....	30,342,383	6,435,335
Northwestern States.....	10,567,612	3,409,502
Southern States.....	13,847,302	4,001,299
Pacific States.....	5,651,076	2,402,600
Territories.....	563,800	211,866
Totals .....	\$105,535,936	\$60,064,208

It will be noted that the liabilities of those failing in the Middle States in the first six months of 1900 were \$3,616,207 less than they were in 1896. In the Western States they were \$23,907,048 less. In the Northwestern States they were \$7,158,110 less. In the Southern States they were \$9,846,103 less. In the Pacific States they were \$3,248,476 less. In the Territories they were \$351,934 less, a grand total of \$45,471,728 less than in 1896.

Only in the Eastern States where the "hated aggregation of wealth," as the Democrats term it, is supposed to exist, were there more failures this year than in 1896.

